



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

can not be shifted or changed, we insist that the center is not of an individual nature, it is not a particular place, it is not a personality after the fashion of man. The very expression "center" is purely allegorical, for it is a center which is omnipresent; it is an ideal center. It is a center only in the sense that the normative factors of the world constitute a unity, a systematic and consistent whole, but it is not local nor does it partake of any of the characteristics of particularity.

Accordingly we see in Mr. Cator's scholastic treatment of the subject an anthropomorphic statement of a truth of which he has caught a glimpse, and the significance of which he has understood as an astrologer may grasp the grandeur of astronomical truths.

EDITOR.

#### A COMMENT ON "EVOLUTION AND THE SOUL."

I read with great pleasure Dr. Carus's thoughtful and original paper in the April *Monist* on "Evolution and the Soul" and with his permission would make a brief comment.

I am glad Dr. Carus believes the universe is intelligible, and that he does not think the origin of life is an unfathomable mystery.

Dr. Carus affirms that "it may be considered as an established fact that life is a function, not an entity or substance." Who has established this? Are there not great physicists on the other side, and does not Dr. Carus hypothecate his own contention when he says that life is a "phenomenon *sui generis*?" And how does he know it is the "tendency of certain elements to organize into life-plasm?" Is it not well to remember that evolution is not a potentiality, but a path? Now a path cannot make itself, nor determine who shall walk upon it. Dr. Carus is so enthusiastically a monist that he hesitates to say there are two things, soul and body. Yet mind or soul may have been in some primeval atom, and while mysteriously united with matter mind may not have been an efflorescence from it. When we attribute an effect to the vibration of the ether, to chemical or physical action, have we exhausted the whole truth of things?

Dr. Carus states that "all existence bears in itself the power of spontaneous motion." Is not this disputed by the great physicists, for example, Lord Kelvin and Sir Oliver Lodge?

And does he not leap over the gulf (which he himself admits) between the physical and chemical world and organized life by the

phrase, "that every atom possesses subjectivity, a potentiality of feeling, out of which the soul of man is woven?" Is not this Tyndall's theory, though I believe he abandoned it in his later years?

Dr. Carus says "that mind is nothing but the sum total of, and the interactions among all these feelings." Is not this pure guessing? How does he cross the gulf between feeling and volition, sentiency and creations like the Parthenon, the Sistine Madonna, Hamlet, and *The Descent of Man*?

And I ask, how do we know that "character is a matter of form," that "life is simply a question of *form*?" Dr. Carus affirms that the material form produces the feeling. But may it not be that the feeling produces the form? Can blind forces create an intelligent soul? May not life, which is dependent on matter for its phenomenal appearance, be independent of it? Do things come to their fruition, not by the higher but by the lower element?

JAMES G. TOWNSEND.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y.

#### EDITORIAL REPLY.

The Rev. James G. Townsend is a preacher highly respected among the fraternity of Unitarian ministers, and we give publicity to his criticism to show our readers the problems implied and what men of a different position have to say on these subjects; but we hope we shall not be obliged for that reason to reply to all the questions that he raises, because they would actually demand the writing of whole volumes in order to be thoroughly answered. We can only say that the monistic world-conception is simple and disposes of many problems which in a dualistic philosophy become extremely involved and improbable. We can see the mind of a child grow in perfect parallelism with his body according to the amount of experience that he imbibes. We have every reason to assume that the origin of the soul takes place simultaneously with the origin of the body, and so we come to the conclusion that life, the activity of a living organism, is not a substance but a function. But even assuming that life were not a function but an entity, the difference of the life tendencies would originate according to their different forms and so even on this assumption character would remain a matter of form.

That certain elements have a tendency to organize into life plasm is a matter of observation, not of theory. It can be verified as well as the other fact that under special conditions some elements